UNITED STATES DISTRICT COLLAT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS Boston Division

COMPLAINT	FOR	VIOLATION	OF	CIVIL	RIGHTS
-----------	-----	-----------	----	-------	--------

(Prisoner Complaint)

Civil Action No.

Jonathan Rivera. Plaintiffs

VS.

Commissioner Carol Mich

Defendant.

In her official Capacity).

1. JURISDICTION & VENUE

This is a civil action authorized by 42 U.S.C. Section 1983 to redress the deprivation, under color of state law of rights secured by the Constitution of Massachusetts and of the United States Constitution ("U.S.C.").

This Court has Jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1331 and 1343 (a) (3). Plaintiff's claims for Injunctive Belief is authorized by 28 U.S.C. Section 2283 and 2284, and Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("Fed-R- of Civ. Pro.").

Pursuant to at us.c. section 1391(b) (a) this District's Court is the appropriate Venue for this action.

IL PARTIES

Plaintiff:

Jonathan hivera (hereinafter referred to as "Mr_Rivera"). inmate number W99979 , is a convicted State inmate with the Massachusetts Department of Corrections. At all relevant times in this action Mr. hivera has been in the lawful custody of Commissioner Carol Mici (hereinafter referred to as "Def. Mici"). The Plaintiff currently resides at the following institution and address:

Soura Baranowski Correctional Center One Harvard Road, P.D. Box 8000 Shirley, Massachusetts 01464.

De Fendant

Carol Mici is the Commissioner for the Massachusetts DePartment of Corrections and she is the custodian of Mr. hivera's habeas corpus (Person holding body) and is the final authority of the "Inmate Discipline" Procedure under 103 CMA 430.00. Her work of Place address is at the following address:

Massachusetts DePartment of Corrections
Headquarters
50 Marle Street, Ste 3
Milford, Massachusetts <u>O1757</u>

DE FACTS

- 1. On the 23rd of February, year 2022, an institutional Hearing Officer for the Massachusetts Department of Corrections ("Department") found Mr. Aivera to been quilty of a serious institutional infractions under the Department's governing Procedure for immate disciplinary actions of 103 CMA 430.00 Inmate Discipline.
- 2. Pursuant to 103 cmh 430:00 Inmate DisciPline (01) Purpose: 103

 cmh 430:00 establishes a fair and impartial system Governing

 Massachusetts Department of corrections Inmote disciPlinary Proceedings. The Process is intended to serve as a method of maintaining order in the institutions while encouraging Positive inmate behavior change.
- 3. The disciplinary process allows prison officials to Punish inmates according to established "Sanctions", including but not limited to Placement in segregations loss of telephone uses loss of Physical Contact via visitation with family; and loss of good time.
- 4. The severity of behaviors are categorized in sections 1,2,3, and 45 with those established in category 1 being the most severe of inmate behaviors or violations to Prison rules.

I ... conting FACTS]

- 5. Mr. hivera was found quilty of Category 1/08 Possessians manufacture, or introduction of any quan firearm, weapon, sharpened instrument, knife or Poison or any component thereof.
- 6. A disciplinary report Generated by an investigator, its Lieutenant Christopher Phelos, at NCCI-Gardner, reported:

Iwhile I "... conducting a search of cell # Na7 in Al housing unit which belongs to inmate hWEAA. While searching hWEAA'S assigned cell stand-up locker, I found a purile i plastic toothbrush, that was sharpened to a point and approximately 5 inches in length... hWEAA was subsequently placed in the hestrictive Housing Unit."

This event is reported to have occurred on January 24, 2022,

- 7. Mr. hivera exercised his right to present a defense and attempted to introduce exculpatorial evidence by reducesting review of the security video footage to prove another individual may have put the "sharpened instrument" in Mr. hivera's assigned housing area and to suestion witnesses.
- 8. The institutional disciplinary officer (a partial staff member)
 cleemed the evidence reducest as "irrelevant" to the action. It
 is abvious as to why this evidence would have been relevant.

- 9- However, this is the Point of Mr. hivera bringing this Action on this instant Complaint. The lack of impartiality of the immate disciplinary process, as set out in 163 cm/h 430.00, causes immates including Mr. hivera subjection to cruel and unusual punishment and violation to their due process rights because while there is exculpatorial or other favorable evidence for an accused immate he will not be able to successfully abtain that evidence via the prison official (clisciplinary officer who is not the Hearing Officer) who is not considered a procedurally-impartial official-
- 10. This being, the tack of impartially on obtaining favorable evidence has caused Mr. hivera to be subjected to cruel and unusual Punish because as a result Mr. hivera was removed from the ammunities of General Pollulation and Placed in Segregation, loss telephone access to his family and friends, transfer to a maxium security Prison; and mental anguish from those Punishments.
- 11. In addition to the Procedent's importiolity, or the lack thereof. Mr. hivera and other inmotes who has been or will be subjected to the disciplinary hearing process statements (of defense) will never outweigh the truthful and credibility of any staff member.

- HEAPING OFFICER! If an immate reports the Presence of the Reporting officer for even if he does not); the Hearing officer may accept the reporting staff's person's statement in the report as true. Provided that the report is based on the staff person's eye-witness account or other personal Knowledge and is other-wise credible. I... I
- 13. Collectively and when considered with the claims of the precedent lack of impartiality, the subsection or article is a complete unfair and partial process that would almost everytime subject immates as it has to Mr. hivera to the cruel and unusual punishment because there will particularly be no favorable due process for the accused, because a staff member; especially a ranking staff member or livestigator's report will always be "accepted as true...and credible" over the word of a convict, and the immate will not be able to petition favorable evidence of any kind through the partial disciplinary officer to which will be deemed "Firelevant."

Although this subsection and article includes "... I the Hearing officer is not required to accept it (report) as true" Mr. Rivera will offer overwhelming evidence showing this is never proceeded.

For example, in Mr. hivera's case he was reported to have 14. had a "sharpened toothbrush to a point" in his "stand-up locker" (1) Mr hivera filed a timely repuest for evidence with the disciplinary officer to have the video footage of the area of the "Stand-up" to prove another innate planted the "sharpened toothbrush" in his assigned area if an instrument was in fact found, (2) any staff or inmote with knowledge to the events leading up to incident to suestion the persons with any knowledge, and (3) DNA testing on the instrument. All request were denied and/or considered irrelevant by the Partial stoff restansible for Gatherine and Presentine Mr. Rivera and the Hearing Officer with. Next, the reporting staff member, who was a high ranking investigator with the Inner Perimeter Security Unit: testified at the hearing the sharpened instrument was not found in the stand-up locker location but in another location not originally mentioned in the report. Finally, the staff member testified it was very well possible another immate could have placed the instrument in Mr. hivera's assigned area because the area was not otherwise secured with Mr. hirera's lock. According to, and as the Hearing Officer concluded in his quilty finding writings, the reporting officer testimony and report was found to been true and credible according to the subsection mention Previously in this action.

- 15. Therefores the specific subsection as to the credibility of a reporting staff member being automatic under 430.14(5) should be removed completely as unconstitutional and unfair allowing the weight of both the immate and staff be determined as true and credible by the Hearing officer at the actual hearing after the facts are desputed by both Parties.

 Not as having the immate's facts and defense to be deemed not credible and unitrue because his word and evidence is against that of a staff who is builte frankly deemed as credible and true on the face of their official authority and reporting.
- 16. Just as the same. Mr. Aivera- and inmotes who may been or have been was subjected to no adequate due process because evidence recovested in favor of the accused will never been discovered or admitted because the individual personnel responsible for obtaining the evidence is a procedural-partial Party to the invaried discipline process. Thus, conflicting 103 cmh 430. as (a) Parpose that "establishes a fair and impartial -- process." SEE PAGE 3 at 2 of this Complaint.

- 19. Therefore, to correct and seek relief for his Past subjection to cruel and unusual Punishment and denial of due Process; and to Prevent any further violations to his civil rights through his disciplinary process if ever applicable a bain, Mr. Rivera seeks relief from this Court.
- 18. Pursuant to 103 cmh Inmate Discipline "Applicability" I... I 103 cmh 430.00 is not intended to confer any procedural or substantive rights not otherwise granted by State or Fedlaw.

IV. EXAUSTION OF ARMINISTRATIVE BEMEDY

19- Mr. hiver appealed his disciplinary related contentions to the highest level of appellate review. On the 13 of March 12022 that appeal was denied. SEE COMPLAINT ATTACHMENT NO. 1

V. LEGAL CLAIKS

20. Defendant Mici has acted and continue to under color of State law by implimenting and failing to correct, amend, and/or remove subsection 430.00C14NGS and to employ impartial disciplinary officers.

21. As a result: Mr. hivera and other inmates constitutional and Procedural due Process rights under the 14th Amendment and cruel and cinusual Punishment Prohibitation are Violated under the 8th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

VII. INJUMIES

- 22. Loss of 42,000 for retention of Private counsel for representation at Disciplinary Hearing
- 23. Cruel and Unusual Punishment and emotional distress by Placement in segregation
- 24. Emotional distress by not being able to contact family for emotional and mental support due to Phone restriction sanction.

VI- BELIEF

- 25. \$2,000 in attoined fre recovery cost
- 26. hecovery of fees associated with this Action and filling cost
- 29. DIRECTIVE and/or Declaratory helief to Defendant Mici of the unconstitutionality of the disciplinary Process claims in this action and to rectfy such claims.

IX. CERTIFICATION AND CLOSING

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, by signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge information and belief that this complaint: (1) is not being presented for improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unncessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation: (2) is sufficited by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing laws (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary suffort are if specifically so identified will likely have evidentiary suffort after a reasonable offertunity for further investigation or discoverys and (4) the Complaint otherwise complies with the requirements of Rule 17.

A. FOR PARTLES WITHOUT AN ATTORNEY

I agree to provide the Clerk's Office with any changes to my address where case-related papers may be served. I understand that my failure to keep a current address on file with the Clerk's Office may result in the dismissal of my case.

Signature of Plaintiff: 13, 2022

Signature of Plaintiff: 10 April 13, 2022

Prisan Identification #: W99979

Prisan Address: Souzo Baranowski Correctional Center

One Harvard Apadi P.D. Box 8000

Shirley MA 01469

City State Zir Code